

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner Evan Langdon and Supervisor Kathy Matecki for the telephone interview conducted on July 15, 2004.

In the Office Action mailed July 2, 2004, claims 7 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for including rope or tubing as a web. In the present Amendment, Applicants have removed rope and tubing from claims 7 and 22 and respectively submit that these claims do not suffer from any §112 deficiencies.

Also in the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-13, 16, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by McDonald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,034,928).

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rice (U. S. Patent No. 1,677,497).

Claims 5-7, 7-12, and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by O'Connor (U. S. Patent No. 4,568,033).

Claims 1-13 and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Goldsmith (U. S. Patent No. 2,082,489).

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 17, and 18 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Ball (U. S. Patent No. 5,310,056).

Claims 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over McDonald. Respectfully, McDonald does not disclose a rolled web product that includes a web wrapped around the core in which the web is formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component between the first end and the second end of the web.

McDonald is directed toward an apparatus and process for producing a roll of separable folded sheets or bags (see McDonald at column 2, lines 10-12, lines 17-20, lines 38-40, and lines 46-50). The primary object of McDonald is to provide an apparatus that can assemble a plurality of discreet sheets, strips or bags into coreless rolls (see McDonald at column 2, lines 5-8). The bags 40 and 40' are separate components that are interfolded with one another and wound in order to form the roll assembly (see Figures 3-3c of McDonald). As such, a plurality of components 40, 40' are interfolded with one another in order to form the web.

Claim 1 of Applicants' application calls for the web to be formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component between the first end and the second end. The single sheet of claim 1 may be made from one or more layers, and may or may not have perforations included thereon. The separate bags 40, 40' of McDonald are folded onto one another and wound in order to form the roll assembly and cannot reasonably be considered to include a web formed from a single sheet that is an endless component between the first end and the second end as set for in claim 1 of Applicants' application.

Further, McDonald specifically teaches against having a web formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component. McDonald specifically states that a web formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component is disfavored

because these types of webs are usually large and cumbersome to handle (see McDonald at column 1, lines 43-47). McDonald is specifically directed towards a web formed from multiple sheets, and specifically teaches against a web formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component (see McDonald at column 2, lines 44-49).

In as much as McDonald could possibly be interpreted to include only a single sheet, for instance during the situation in which all of the bags of McDonald have been removed from the roll except the for final remaining bag, claim 1 calls for the web to be wound in a first direction and also in a second and opposite direction in alternating sequence a plurality of times. The final single bag 40 of McDonald will not be wound in a first direction and a second direction in alternating sequence a plurality of times, since the bag 40 is only folded a single time as shown in Figs. 3 and 3A.

Claim 1 has also been amended in order to call for a rolled web product in which the web is positioned upon the core so as to have the same axial position with respect to the axis of the core along the entire length of the web from the first end of the web to the second end of the web. O'Connor, Rice, and Goldsmith do not disclose the structure called for in claim 1 of Applicants' application.

O'Connor discloses an apparatus for winding a package of tape in which the tape is wound onto a mandrel or core by first making a plurality of spiral turns 15 (see O'Connor at column 4, lines 38-40). Once a step or flanged portion is formed, the winding position of the tape is then traversed towards the right so that a subsequent layer of tape formed over and next to the step or flanged portion is wound (see O'Connor at column 4, lines 40-46; and Figure 2). Next, a second step or flanged

portion is formed upon winding a plurality of spirals 19, 20 (see O'Connor at column 4, lines 50-54; and Figure 3). Once the spirally wound shoulders are formed on either end, a series of helical traverses 22 are formed therebetween (see O'Connor at column 4, lines 60-62). O'Connor is specifically directed towards the winding of tape in which the roll is formed by a series of both traverse and spiral windings (see O'Connor at column 4, lines 56-58).

Rice discloses a twine ball and a cover for a twine ball. The windings of twine forming the main body 10 are wound by means of spiral turns that run back and forth with respect to the length of the core or mandrel (see Rice at page 2, lines 66-68; and Figure 1). As can be clearly seen in Figure 1, the twine forming the body 10 is wound at an angle with respect to the central core or mandrel. Additionally, the cover winding 12 for the twine ball includes runs that are wound at an acute angle to the core or mandrel of the twine ball from the bottom to the top of the ball (see Rice at page 2, lines 20-25; and Figure 1). Therefore, all of the windings disclosed in Rice are wound at an angle with respect to the core or mandrel.

Goldsmith is directed towards a method of winding and unwinding twistable materials, distinguished from previous methods, in which the web is wound in the same direction substantially tangential to the peripheral surface of the core or mandrel (see Goldsmith at page 1, lines 12-18). The web of Goldsmith is wound in a transverse manner along the length of the core or mandrel so as to form a plurality of convolutions 22 (see Goldsmith at page 2, lines 60-65; and Figures 1 and 4-6). By winding the web transversely across the core or mandrel, the series of convolutions are arranged so that the web will be free from twisting when unwound (see Goldsmith at page 2, lines 10-24).

As such, the entire disclosure of Goldsmith is directed towards the winding of a web at an angle with respect to the axis of the core or mandrel.

Claim 1 of Applicants' application calls for the web to be positioned upon the core so as to have the same axial position with respect to the axis of the core along the length of the web from the first end of the web to the second end of the web. As mentioned, the disclosures in Goldsmith, Rice, and O'Connor all disclose a web positioned on a core or mandrel that is wound so as to have different axial positions with respect to the axis of the core or mandrel.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over McDonald, O'Connor, Rice, and Goldsmith and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims that depend from claim 1 (claims 2-7) are also in condition for allowance as their rejections are made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

Claim 8 was amended in order to call for a rolled product with a web formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless component between the first end and the second end. Additionally, claim 8 has been amended in order to call for the web to be configured so as to have the same axial position with respect to the axis of the center space along the length of the web from the first end of the web to the second end of the web. Although not exact, the amendments made to claim 8 are similar to the amendments made to claim 1, and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 defines over McDonald, O'Connor, Rice, and Goldsmith for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is in condition for allowance. Also, all claims that depend from claim 8 (claims 9-15) are also in condition for allowance. The rejections to claims 9-15 are made moot due to the allowance of claim 8.

In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 16 in order to call for a method of winding a web about a central axis that includes a web formed from a single sheet that is a continuous endless components between a first and second end of the web. The method also includes the web positioned on the mandrel so as to have the same axial position with respect to the axis of the mandrel along the length of the web from the first end of the web to the second end of the web. Although not exact, the amendments made to claim 16 are similar to the amendments made to claim 1 and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 defines over McDonald, Rice, O'Connor, and Goldsmith for essentially the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims that depend from claim 16 (claims 17-22) are also in condition for allowance. The rejections to claims 17-22 are made moot due to the allowance of claim 16.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience should he have any questions concerning this matter or require any additional information.

September 29, 2004
Date

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

Neal P. Pierotti

Neal P. Pierotti
Reg. No. 45,716
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
FAX (864) 233-7342